



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/059,076	01/28/2002	Thomas J. Perkowski	100-058USANCO	7594
84704	7590	03/27/2009		
Thomas J. Perkowski, Esq., P. C. Soundview Plaza 1266 East Main Street Stamford, CT 06902				
EXAMINER				
FADOK, MARK A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3625				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/27/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/059,076

Applicant(s)

PERKOWSKI, THOMAS J.

Examiner

MARK FADOK

Art Unit

3625

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 130-145 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 130-145 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The examiner is in receipt of applicant's response to office action mailed 9/19/2008, which was received 2/24/2009. Acknowledgement is made to the cancellation of claims 1-129 and the addition of claims 130-145. Applicant's amendment and remarks have been carefully considered and were found to be persuasive, however, after further consideration the following new ground of rejection follows that was necessitated by amendment.

Double Patenting

Applicant has created quite a tangled web of similarly-focused pending applications, many of which are being examiner by this examiner. There appears to be no apparent rhyme or reason why so many applications are copending, nor any focus on any particular inventive twist or direction specific to each case, thus failing to create a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822. For this reason, there are an overwhelming amount of overlapping claims and concepts which are subject to the following double patenting issues.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not

identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Omum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321 (c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement. Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 130-146 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the following claims of the following copending applications.

<u>Application</u>	<u>Claims</u>
09/716848	497-507
10/876261	154-170

10/812341	31-57
10/059078	49-58
10/602990	63-107
10/693856	63-88
11/823828	8-21,37-53
10/059076	78-99
10/058970	98-115
09/695744	478-489
10/058970	98-115
09/695744	478-489
11/804769	1,3-19

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other for the following reasons:

- It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have provided such a system whether it is for offered products identified by product name, description, trademark or for offered services identified by service names, descriptions and service marks.

- It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have characterized a BIN network with UPN/TM and URLs in a similar fashion as a collection of CPI links (URLs) in association with UPN/TM.

- A catalog of MMVK tags is taken to be equivalent to a library of MMVK tags and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have employed a collection of tags so that the system can properly link to a URL (by a well known HTML tag) so that the consumer can request and receive product information for a particular product.

- It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have programmed the display modes of the MMVKs so that they deliver "information resources" as relevant to the consumer-requested product or service.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 130-146 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- Claims 130-145 are system (apparatus) claims, yet include many features which are

presented as method steps rather than capabilities, rendering the claim scope uncertain. In these computer-based system claims, the best way to set forth apparatus structure is to claim capabilities of the apparatus by stating an element/module /subsystem is programmed to or is configured to , rather than claiming the element actively performs the act. A claim covering both an apparatus and a method of using that apparatus is invalid because such a claim "is not sufficiently precise to provide competitors with an accurate determination of the 'metes and bounds' of protection involved" and is "ambiguous." MPEP 2173.05(p)(ii).

- o Claim 130 - products offered for sale; first internet-enabled information server generates and serves each said MMVK; said web browser displays a GUI; programming said display modes; web browser...processes said MMVK tag; first internet-enabled information server automatically executes...and generates and serves.

- o Claim 139- management system...imports.

- o Claim 140 and 141, it is not clear whether applicant is attempting to actually claim the user's web browser as part of the apparatus claim - and if so, what browser capability is being claimed? If not, it is unclear in what way the apparatus/system is being further limited.

Further it is noted that applicant uses the term "for" and "allow" in many instances. The examiner notes that this is not a positive recitation of the feature that follows and is features that follow are given little patentable weight since the features that follow are considered intended use. The examiner suggests that applicant remove

the term "for" or "allow" to create a positive recitation of the claimed features.

Appropriate correction is required.

As best understood, claims 130-145 appear to be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Mark Fadok** whose telephone number is **571.272.6755**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday thru Friday 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Jeffrey Smith** can be reached on **571.272.6763**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Va. 22313-1450

or faxed to:

571-273-8300 [Official communications; including
After Final communications labeled
"Box AF"]

For general questions the receptionist can be reached at
571.272.3600

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/059,076

Page 9

Art Unit: 3625

/Mark Fadok/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3625